

Editor's Introduction

Peace Studies: Critical Concepts in Political Science*

Matthew Evangelista

The end of the Cold War has unfortunately not fulfilled optimistic hopes of a new era of peace. On the contrary, interstate wars and civil and ethnic conflicts have continued to preoccupy political leaders and wreak destruction and deprivation on communities throughout the world. The academic field of Peace Studies emerged during the Cold War to address the nature and sources of interstate and internal conflict and methods to prevent it and deal with its consequences. Although clearly international and interdisciplinary, the field enjoys particularly strong representation in Northern Europe and North America and in the discipline of political science. The International Peace Research Association, founded in 1964 and currently based in Japan, links peace research organizations on five continents. In the United States alone there are over 500 colleges and universities with Peace Studies programs and a national Peace and Justice Association that brings together educators, activists and researchers. More than a dozen periodicals, such as the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, are devoted primarily to Peace Studies, with several others, such as *International Security*, combining a mix of Peace Studies, Security Studies, and analysis of foreign policy.

Despite such a high level of activity and attention, there is no single collection of articles that offers a coherent and comprehensive overview of the field of Peace Studies. This collection marks an attempt to do that. Any collection of this sort, compiled by a single individual, is, however, likely to be idiosyncratic, reflecting the editor's own background, knowledge, and tastes. Even a multi-volume collection necessarily leaves out many, many important articles. Moreover, some key authors in the field have made their main contributions by publishing books rather than articles. Their influence is reflected in the articles of others who pursued their ideas.

* From Matthew Evangelista, ed., *Peace Studies: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, 4 vols. (London: Routledge, 2005).

Peace Studies means many things to many people. It is an interdisciplinary field, built upon contributions from psychology, sociology, history, political science, and economics, among others. It differs from related fields such as Strategic Studies or Security Studies in its implicit normative and teleological orientation: an expectation that scholarly research can contribute to reducing the sources of conflict -- social injustice, economic inequality, scarcity, discrimination of various sorts, as well as the political and military practices that lead to war -- to produce a more just and peaceful world. Although the broadest definition of Peace Studies would include such disparate topics as domestic violence, racism, internal protest movements, and the like, the present collection, part of the Routledge series of *Critical Concepts in Political Science*, is devoted mainly to those aspects of Peace Studies that engage political scientists studying International Relations. Even here not every important topic can be covered. More space would have permitted inclusion of articles on such topics as the international arms trade, the relationship between weapons production and economic development, and conversion of military production to civilian uses -- subjects of significant work by peace researchers over the years.¹

Although Peace Studies is an international field, much of the scholarship appears in English, and North American and European publishers predominate. The present collection seeks, nevertheless, to give a sense of the multinational character of Peace Studies. The countries discussed in the works published here span the entire globe. For this collection, the list of countries representing either the place of original publication of an article, or its author's country of origin or present affiliation, includes: Argentina, Canada, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Norway, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Most of the articles originally appeared in English, but some have been translated, usually by the authors themselves.

This collection represents a mix of: articles that many would recognize as "classics" of Peace Studies; more recent and forward-looking studies of topics likely to preoccupy the field in the years ahead; and the occasional

¹ For some representative work on these topics, see: Nicole Ball, *Security and Economy in the Third World* (Princeton: NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988); Michael Klare, et al., *Global Weapons and Proliferation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995); William W. Keller, *Arm in Arm: The Political Economy of the Global Arms Trade* (New York: Basic Books, 1995); Lloyd J. Dumas, *The Socio-Economics of Conversion from War to Peace* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1995); and the journal edited by Bjorn Moeller, *NOD [non-offensive defense] and Conversion*.

article that has escaped wide attention, but in the editor's judgment makes an important contribution to the field. The rest of this introduction seeks to put the articles of this collection into their historical and political context and indicate their importance for the field of Peace Studies. It is divided according to the subject headings of the four volumes that make up this collection.

Volume I

War and Peace: The Scope of the Problem. The first volume begins with an overview of the field of Peace Studies and the problems it seeks to address. It starts with a seminal article by one of the pioneers of the field, the Norwegian sociologist Johan Galtung. In 1959 Galtung founded the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo (PRIO) and its *Journal of Peace Research*. The article, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," appeared ten years later at the end of his term as director. It constitutes a major statement on the nature of the field and it introduced key terms that provided the basis for debates that continue to the present. Taking as his starting point the definition of peace as the "absence of violence," he proposed a broader understanding of peace that drew on the concept of "structural violence," a synonym for social injustice. For Galtung, "negative peace" is the absence of personal physical or psychological violence, whereas "positive peace" is the absence of structural violence. The quest for peace then becomes inseparable from the quest for social justice. Some scholars have pursued this line of reasoning to develop further distinctions and relationships between such concepts as "unorganized, direct microlevel violence" (such as spousal abuse at home) and "organized indirect macrolevel violence" (such as economic inequality).²

Galtung's article spurred decades of debate about the proper scope of the field. In 2003, Harald Mueller, director of the Peace Research Institute of Frankfurt, Germany (PRIF), published an important paper taking stock of the state of the debate on definitions of peace. It appears in this volume, both for its review of a vast amount of important German literature that could not be included here, and for its original insights and contributions. Among other things, Mueller takes Galtung to task for including social

² Birgit Brock-Utne, 'Linking the Micro and Macro in Peace and Development Studies', J. Turpin and L.Kurtz, eds., *The Web of Violence* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997), pp.149-161.

injustice in his very definition of violence, thereby making it impossible to study the *relationship* of justice to peace or injustice as a variable contributing to violence. Mueller's essay also provides a useful overview of several areas of literature, on the "Democratic Peace" and security communities, for example, which are represented in later volumes of this collection.

The next two articles of this section represent the empirical and ethical dimensions of war and peace studies. The first is by Milton Leitenberg, a scholar who began his career in peace studies at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) in the 1960s; it represents the culmination of many years of research into the consequences of war and violent internal conflict. Leitenberg also engages to a degree the debate on "structural violence" and he provides a valuable discussion of the methodological issues involved in compiling data on wars. The next piece is an overview of the ethical issues associated with war, provided by Henry Shue, a philosopher at Cornell and Oxford Universities, and one of the most prominent and thoughtful specialists on the topic. It sets the stage for further discussion of ethical and legal questions in Volume III.

The final piece of this section is by Randall Caroline Forsberg, a scholar-activist who got her start at SIPRI and went on to initiate the movement for a Nuclear Weapons Freeze and other disarmament campaigns in the United States. This article is a distillation of her PhD dissertation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (whose Defense Studies Program has turned out a considerable number of peace researchers as well as future Pentagon officials). It is an important work of enormous historical and multidisciplinary scope that seeks to put war in the broader context of socially-sanctioned violence. By relating war to practices, such as slavery, human sacrifice, and torture, Forsberg suggests that social norms have evolved over the centuries to stigmatize such behavior. By understanding the process by which those norms evolved, we can also perceive a path to the ultimate eradication of war as a social institution. Forsberg's theoretical and historical analysis provides valuable background for many of the subsequent articles in this collection and undergirds the policy proposals presented in "Global Action to Prevent War," the document that closes out the final volume.

Theories of Cooperation and Conflict. The causes of war and peace can be understood as part of the larger question of the sources of conflict and

cooperation. Many of the key contributions in this area come from political psychologists, such as Robert Jervis and Deborah Larson, but some of the key insights came with the work of the British economist Kenneth Boulding, whose article, “National Images and International Systems,” appeared in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* in 1959. Boulding sought to formalize concepts, such as hostility or friendliness, that would seem inherently subjective, and he developed simple mathematical models, associated with game theory, to illustrate his ideas – a practice that became increasingly popular in some areas of the field.³ Perhaps the most influential use of game theory in International Relations, and a major contribution to theories of conflict and cooperation, was Robert Jervis’s “Cooperation under the Security Dilemma,” which introduced generations of students to the Prisoner’s Dilemma and its application to real-world security problems such as ballistic-missile defense.

Robert Axelrod is another name very much associated with the Prisoner’s Dilemma and the “solution” he produced by organizing a computer tournament to identify the most effective strategy. His contribution came in the suggestion that a strategy of “tit-for-tat” reciprocity would lead to the emergence of cooperation even among self-interested actors (“egoists”). His article, and a later book, sought to apply the insight to a wide range of human (and non-human) behavior, including arms races. Axelrod’s work came under criticism, however, from political scientists who found troubling the assumption (that he shares with many in the field of International Relations) that states in an international system could be modeled as unitary, rational actors, which, in the Prisoner’s Dilemma model, are not even able to communicate with each other. Deborah Larson, a political psychologist, drew on the work of Charles Osgood, to suggest that in more realistic conditions of interstate conflict, countries’ leaders held “inherent bad-faith images” of the other side that would be difficult to overcome with single actions that would be reversed if not met with immediate reciprocation. Larson, in an important article on the origins of the Austrian State Treaty of 1955, finds that Osgood’s proposal for “graduated and reciprocated initiatives in tension reduction,” or GRIT, provides a better understanding of how Cold War rivals came to cooperate on a key security question. Matthew Evangelista’s study of disarmament negotiations during the same period, drawing on declassified historical documents, challenged an

³ Formal mathematical work on conflict has spawned a separate, but related field of Peace Science, represented mainly by economists, such as Cornell University’s Walter Isard.

assumption common to both Axelrod's and Larson's work – that the United States and the Soviet Union genuinely desired cooperation but were locked in a Prisoner's Dilemma that prevented it. He called attention to domestic political factors, especially in the United States, that made "defection" the preferred outcome and the game of Deadlock the more appropriate metaphor.

One of the most influential theorists of strategic bargaining is Thomas Schelling, an economist who worked for many years on nuclear strategy at the RAND Corporation think-tank before joining the faculty of Harvard University. As Richard Ned Lebow points out in his insightful critique, Schelling was not a peace researcher, but a "cold warrior," whose ideas contributed to the disastrous Vietnam War and the near-disastrous Cuban missile crisis, and are therefore important for those in Peace Studies to understand. On the more positive side, Janice Gross Stein offers a review of theories of conflict resolution, many from the field of political psychology, that tie together issues of national identity and enemy images introduced by Boulding many decades ago. Finally Neta Crawford takes us back many centuries to evaluate theories of cooperation and conflict in light of the experience of the Iroquois Nations of North America. In doing so she engages a wide range of literatures on security communities, regime theory, alliance behavior, and the Democratic Peace, subjects that subsequent articles in this collection pursue.

Volume II

Causes of War. In his 1939 study of what soon became known as the interwar period, E.H. Carr wrote that "the passionate desire to prevent war determined the whole initial course and direction of the study" of international politics.⁴ The task of explaining and devising means to prevent war still dominates much of the field of International Relations and Peace Studies and is the focus of Volume II of the present collection. Unfortunately only a small sample of key works can be presented here.⁵

⁴ E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1946 [1939]), p. 8.

⁵ For an extensive review, see Jack Levy, "The Causes of War: A Review of Theories and Evidence." In Philip E. Tetlock, Jo L. Husbands, Robert Jervis, Paul C. Stern, and Charles Tilly, eds. *Behavior, Society, and Nuclear War*, vol. I (New York: Oxford University Press (for the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council, 1989), pp. 209-333.

Absent is work inspired by the Quaker mathematician Lewis Fry Richardson, although his influence on Peace Studies is considerable, particularly for those who favor quantitative methods of analysis.⁶ Also missing from this collection, understandably, are the book-length studies that address the long-term causes of war, particularly those driven by uneven economic development of the major powers.⁷ Although both qualitative and quantitative methods are represented here, the focus is on the shorter-term factors, and, particularly, ones that might be subject to manipulation in the interest of preventing war.

The origins of World War I have been the focus of enormous study, and Stephen Van Evera's article summarizes the range of explanations offered, suggests a parsimonious alternative based on the "cult of the offensive," and indicates why scholars concerned about the nuclear arms race in 1984 devoted so much attention to 1914. Because World War II seemed so different from its predecessor, Jack Snyder and Thomas Christensen, in a subsequent article reprinted here, sought to understand whether theories of the "offense-defense balance" and alliance behavior could account for both of them. Ted Hopf went further in seeking to resolve debates about the relative stability of bipolar versus multipolar international systems, drawing upon the experience of 15th Century Europe.

In 1995, James Fearon sought to redirect the study of the causes of war by suggesting that "rational states should have incentives to locate negotiated settlements that all would prefer to the gamble of war." For Fearon, the failure to come to a bargain stems from states' incentives to manipulate their "private information" about their resolve and capabilities and their inability to make a credible commitment to uphold any bargain that would emerge. Jonathan Kirshner, in a response to Fearon's article, challenges some of the central premises of his theory, and, in particular, finds his emphasis on private information unpersuasive. Kirshner points out that even in sports contests, when enormous amounts of information are available about past

⁶ Richardson's main works include *Arms and Insecurity* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1960) and *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels* (Pittsburgh: Boxwood Press, 1960). See also David Wilkinson, *Deadly Quarrels: Lewis F. Richardson and the Statistical Study of War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).

⁷ Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981); A.F.K. Organski and Jacek Kugler, *The War Ledger* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Ernest Mandel, *The Meaning of the Second World War* (London: Verso, 1986); and the work that inspired this line of theorizing, V.I. Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916).

experience and capabilities of the players, and the rules of the game are fixed and known, there is nevertheless a high degree of uncertainty about the outcome. Given the much greater uncertainties involved in war, Kirshner expects that misrepresentation of private information must usually play a rather insignificant role. Kirshner's conclusion, important to the scholarly debates on the causes of war at the turn of the 21st Century, finds support in work of military historians and practitioners of centuries past, such as the Spanish general D. Álvaro Navia-Osorio, Marqués de Santa Cruz de Marcenado. Among many insights of his nine-volume treatise, *Reflexiones Militares*, published in 1724, one finds the claim, rather unfriendly to Fearon's theory, that "nothing is more uncertain than the outcome of a battle, no matter the numerical advantage."⁸

Arms Races and Arms Control. The literature on arms races is closely linked to that on the causes of war, and as voluminous.⁹ This selection focuses on the arms race that was of most concern to the field of Peace Studies as it emerged in the second half of the 20th Century -- the US-Soviet nuclear competition – and efforts to bring it under control through negotiations. J. David Singer's 1958 article presciently set out the question that would stay at the core of the debate for the next several decades: does the production and deployment of weapons increase the perception of threat and thereby exacerbate political relations, or are weapons merely a reflection of preexisting political tensions and conflicts of interest?

Over the years a number of scholars remained unconvinced that procurement of weapons resulted solely from a state's genuine security needs. Fred Block, for example found that the major rearmament in the United States, following World War II, was influenced less by the threat of Soviet military attack and more by a perceived need to revive the economies of Western Europe and integrate them into an open world economy. James Kurth developed a highly sophisticated theory of US arms procurement that highlighted economic, bureaucratic, and political factors at the early stages of the process, and found the behavior of the Soviet adversary figuring mainly at later stages when the weapons required greater support and justification. Matthew Evangelista's comparative study of US and Soviet weapons procurement agreed with much of Kurth's analysis for the US side – that it was driven from the “bottom up,” rather than as a “top-down”

⁸ Quoted in Gianni Riota, *Prince of the Clouds* (New York: Picador, 2001), p. 38.

⁹ For an overview, see Nils Petter Gleditsch & Olav Njølstad, eds., *Arms Races: Technological and Political Dynamics* (London: Sage, 1990).

response to threats; but he found the impetus for new Soviet weapons typically in prior US developments, spurred as a top-down process in a political system that typically stifled bottom-up innovation. He suggested that differences in the two countries' "domestic structures" accounted for the divergent processes of weapons innovation.

Charles Glaser's article examines the relationship between countries' military capabilities, arms-control strategies, and weapons-procurement policies, and their perceptions of the adversary. Thus, he addresses much of the work in cooperation theory and arms-race theory, presented already in Volumes I and II, while providing valuable advances in our understanding of, for example, the spiral and deterrence models offered by Jervis. Emanuel Adler's article also links up to the literature on cooperation theory and international regimes with his well-documented argument about the role of "epistemic communities" of US scientists who promoted arms control as a means of dealing with the US-Soviet nuclear arms race.

Christopher Paine addresses a lesser known dimension of the arms race – the connection between US "counterforce," "war-fighting" nuclear strategies and plans for military intervention in regions such as the oil-rich Persian Gulf. Paine argues, and provides persuasive evidence, that the United States government deliberately designed its strategies to pose the risk of escalation to all-out nuclear war, in order to deter the Soviet Union or other powers and give itself a free hand to intervene in regions it considered strategically or economically important. This analysis remains relevant to the post-Cold War era, as the United States still resists making any commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, even in a conflict that does not involve another nuclear-armed state. The continuing US embrace of nuclear weapons presumably influences the decisions other states make concerning whether or not to develop their own nuclear arsenals. Etel Solingen looks beyond such external security concerns, however, to consider why some states "on the fence" have chosen to adhere to the nuclear nonproliferation regime or nuclear-free zones, whereas others in similar security situations, have pursued nuclear weapons. By focusing on the role of outward-oriented economic liberalization in the calculations of the ruling coalitions in the fence-sitting regimes, Solingen exemplifies the integration of economic and political-military approaches that characterizes some of the best work in Peace Studies.

Volume III

Civil and Ethnic Conflict. The third volume addresses issues that have become particularly acute in the years following the end of the Cold War, even though they were always important. The literature on civil and ethnic conflict is enormous and still growing. This section includes two state-of-the-art literature reviews and three case studies by regional experts. Ashutosh Varshney explores the role of “rationality” in nationalist and ethnic conflict, finding that explanations focusing entirely on self-interest neglect important motivations such as the pursuit of dignity, self-respect, and recognition. Stathis Kalyvas engages the debate between “greed” and “grievance” as motives for action in civil wars. He rejects that simple dichotomy in favor of an understanding of actors’ identities that combines both political and private elements and gives proper scope for ambiguity and contingency.

These themes are taken up in the case studies that follow. V.P. Gagnon, Jr. argues that the wars that destroyed Yugoslavia were not driven as much by interethnic hatred as by political conflict within one group, in particular, the Serbs. Opponents of reform, such as Slobodan Milosevic, sought to demobilize pro-democracy activists through nationalist scape-goating and war. In his study of conflict in the Russian Caucasus, Georgi Derluguian guides the reader through a cast of Islamist radicals, former members of the communist *nomenklatura*, and mafia gangsters and warlords, and places the Chechen war in the context of disintegration of the Soviet economic and political order and the broader world economy. William Reno brings a similar ethnographic sensibility to conflict in Angola and Sierra Leone, where he describes efforts by rulers to salvage their political positions by striking deals with foreign corporations and mercenaries interested in profiting from the countries’ natural resources. The analytical links between politics, economics, and identity that these articles pursue represent important advances in our understanding of the type of warfare that is likely to dominate the new century.

Gender and Conflict. Anyone who has seen Stanley Kubrick’s classic film, *Dr. Strangelove*, will not be surprised by the association of nuclear strategy with sex. His treatment of the issues was, in fact, much closer to reality than many viewers recognized, as Carol Cohn found out as she sought to learn the “technostrategic” language of “defense intellectuals” in the mid-1980s.¹⁰

¹⁰ For an outstanding history of the nuclear strategists, see Fred Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991).

Cohn's article, originally published in the journal *Signs*, is not only a valuable feminist analysis of sexual imagery in nuclear strategy, but an important statement about how language affects thinking and action and an insightful exploration of an influential academic subculture. The gendered nature of war is hardly limited to nuclear strategy. Joshua Goldstein, in his encyclopedic study, *War and Gender*, argues that throughout history war has been mainly a male activity, but that nothing inherent in the genetic make-up of men and women has predetermined that outcome. A review essay of Goldstein's book, reprinted here, finds quite persuasive his nuanced treatment of the relative impact of culture and biology on gender roles, but suggests that he gives inadequate attention to the relationship between nationalism, gender, and conflict. Those issues are taken up in the remaining pieces in the section.

Cynthia Enloe, probably the most prolific scholar of gender and war, offers an analysis of the role of gender and nationalist identities in the wars of former Yugoslavia. She raises questions about the stereotype of women as victims, and men as perpetrators, of ethnic violence. She seeks to find the sources of the atrocities committed in Bosnia in the economic and social pressures that undermined Serbian men's sense of their own masculinity, which they in turn – urged on by nationalist leaders -- sought to bolster by engaging in acts of militarized sexual violence. In her study of the Catholic community in Belfast, geographer Lorraine Dowler examines the gendered spatial relegation of women, both fighters and homemakers, in the context of the conflict in Northern Ireland. Her fascinating interviews support a common finding that nationalist conflict often plays a conservative role in reinforcing unequal gender roles. As headlines report sexual harassment in military academies, female (and male) soldiers abusing Iraqi (and other) prisoners, and mass rape campaigns from Bosnia to Sudan, a focus on gender will likely be an urgent and enduring aspect of Peace Studies in the future.

Terrorism, Counterterrorism, and Peace-building. Issues related to terrorism, “failed states,” and post-conflict situations have become increasingly salient after the end of the Cold War. But, as Peter Katzenstein points out, many countries have a long experience of dealing with these issues. His article discusses the legacy of the counterterrorism policies of Germany and Japan since the 1970s and how it contributes to differences among themselves and with the United States over the appropriate way to respond to the threat from al Qaeda. Fabio Armao's contribution presents an overview of the range of threats to security, including new combinations of

mafia-style criminals, mercenaries, and terrorists, and the inadequacies of current theories and institutions of international relations to help understand how to cope with them. Eva Bertram examines the record of “postconflict peace building” by the United Nations and identifies barriers to success that are likely to remain relevant, especially in the wake of wars in Afghanistan and Iraq of the early 21st Century. Ekaterina Stepanova links many of these issues in her study of the role that terrorism and counterterrorist efforts play in societies in the midst of or emerging from conflict.

Ethical and Legal Aspects. As Henry Shue’s overview in the first volume indicated, an important body of work studies military conflict in the light of ethical approaches, such as Just War Theory, and the legal tradition (international humanitarian law or the “laws of war”) that it underpins. This section begins, however, not with a legal or ethical treatise, but with a work of fiction. Leo Szilard was a Hungarian émigré physicist who first called the US government’s attention to the possibility of an atomic bomb. The letter he drafted to President Franklin Roosevelt, under Albert Einstein’s signature, led to the Manhattan Project that produced the atomic weapons dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Szilard went on to become one of the leading opponents of the US-Soviet nuclear arms race and a prolific generator of ideas to end it.¹¹ In 1947, he published a fictional account of a world in which he and the US political leaders responsible for the atomic bombings of Japan were put on trial for war crimes, much as German leaders were tried at Nuremberg and Japanese ones at Tokyo after World War II. It is an imaginative critique of the problem of double standards and “victor’s justice” that continues to complicate efforts to deal with war crimes and atrocities, even with the recent institution of the International Criminal Court.¹²

The end of the Cold War brought a renewed attention to legal and ethical issues associated with war, and a tendency by the major warring powers to justify military interventions on humanitarian grounds or as anti-terrorist operations (or both). Mona Fixdal and Dan Smith provide an excellent review and application of Just War Theory to humanitarian intervention.

¹¹ Leo Szilard, *Toward a Livable World: Leo Szilard and the Crusade for Nuclear Arms Control* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987); Matthew Evangelista, *Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999).

¹² Jeremy Rabkin, “Nuremberg Misremembered,” *SAIS Review*, vol. 19, no. 2 (1999), pp. 81-96.

They indicate how the conditions of particular cases can render more or less important the satisfaction of particular criteria. For example, the more urgent and severe a humanitarian disaster, the less necessary would be the requirement for “right authority.” Written before the 1999 intervention in Kosovo, the first war ever conducted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the article provides a prescient guide to evaluating its legitimacy. Thomas Smith’s study of the legal dimensions of advanced-technology warfare identifies important gaps in the coverage of international humanitarian law. Of particular concern are weapons that destroy elements of the “infrastructure” that support both civilian and military activities. If the attacks themselves cause few immediate civilian casualties, they can fall into a legal gray area, even if their long-term consequences for society are devastating. Along with new weapons, the “war on terrorism” that began with the attacks of 11 September 2001, and the US military response in Afghanistan and elsewhere, provide major challenges for the laws of armed conflict. Neta Crawford’s essay identifies the most important questions that terrorism and counterterrorism pose to the traditional ethical and legal frameworks.

With the end of the Cold War, many observers -- peace activists and peace researchers, included – expressed the hope that nonviolent means of dealing with conflict would come to the fore. They viewed economic sanctions as a valuable tool for dealing with both internally repressive and externally aggressive regimes. The 1990s saw a dramatic increase in the imposition of sanctions, endorsed by the United Nations Security Council. In their essay, Drew Christiansen and Gerard Powers nevertheless cast doubt on the assumption that sanctions should be understood as a morally superior way of dealing with conflict. They point out what has since become especially apparent with the decade-long sanctions regime against Iraq: Sanctions can exact a high toll on innocent civilians.¹³ Although international law has little to say about the legality of sanctions, the ethical framework of Just War Theory offers important guidelines. Particularly important is the principle of “double effect,” which forbids deliberately harming civilians as either the ends or the means of sanctions, and which calls attention to issues of proportionality and reasonable hope of success.

¹³ David Rieff, “Were Sanctions Right?” *New York Times Magazine*, 27 July 2003.

Volume IV

Security Communities. Paradoxically, most scholars of Peace Studies spend their time studying conflict and war. Volume IV addresses the “peace side” of Peace Studies. One of the oldest concepts in the field is that of the “pluralistic security community,” whose modern variant dates to Karl Deutsch’s pioneering work in the 1950s, but has as its precedent Immanuel Kant’s 1795 treatise on “perpetual peace.” This is an example of a major topic in Peace Studies that has been addressed through books rather than a single definitive article. The 1957 study by Deutsch and his colleagues helped initiate the field of regional integration studies.¹⁴ In the 1990s, Michael Barnett and Emanuel Adler reintroduced the topic of security community with an important edited volume.¹⁵ In the meantime, several scholars sought to link the theory to various empirical referents and to arguments about the so-called Democratic Peace – the finding that countries that democracies rarely or never fight wars against other democracies, although they fight frequently with non-democracies. We have already seen, in Volume I, Neta Crawford’s study of the Iroquois confederacy as a security community. This volume includes a small sampling of other important work on the topic: John Owen’s paired comparison of US-British conflicts under democratic and non-democratic conditions; Ido Oren’s study of how within the US government and in the young academic field of political science, Imperial Germany was considered a model constitutional government, and, presumably, an unlikely enemy, during the years before World War I; Thomas Risse’s study of NATO in the context of Democratic Peace Theory and constructivism; a comparative study of NATO and Asian regional security institutions by Peter Katzenstein and Christopher Hemmer; and, finally, Sebastian Rosato’s thorough-going critique of Democratic Peace Theory on logical and empirical grounds. Even before the US government justified the 2003 invasion of Iraq in part on grounds of exporting democracy by force, variants of the Democratic Peace Theory enjoyed wide currency with US policymaking circles, reinforcing its relevance for peace researchers.

¹⁴ Karl Deutsch, et al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957).

¹⁵ Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, *Security Communities* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Peace Activism. Scholars in the field of Peace Studies have pursued a range of activities related to peace movements. Peace activists have sometimes found the scholarly analyses of conflict useful guides to effective anti-war strategies. On occasion individual scholars themselves have moved from empirical study to action, basing their campaigns on the latest research and asking research questions whose answers will help achieve the political outcomes they advocate. Other scholars have focused their attention on chronicling the history of peace movements, often linking their accounts to broader theories of social movements or international and transnational relations.

This section begins with a document of singular historical importance for the postwar nuclear era: a statement issued by an international group of prominent scientists, including many Nobel laureates, warning of the danger of nuclear war. Drafted by Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher and mathematician, in the wake of the first US tests of a “hydrogen bomb” (capable of explosive power a thousand times greater than the atomic bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki), the statement was endorsed by Albert Einstein and became known as the Russell-Einstein Manifesto. It was presented at a press conference in London in July 1955, organized by Joseph Rotblat, the only Manhattan Project scientist to have quit when the end of the war in Europe cancelled its original purpose of deterring Nazi Germany’s acquisition of atomic weapons. In England, the Manifesto inspired the founding of the popular Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and internationally the Pugwash movement of scientists -- recipient, along with its longtime head Rotblat, of the 1995 Nobel Peace Prize for its work in ending the nuclear arms race and the Cold War.

The Russell-Einstein document and its sentiments had a longer-term impact within the Soviet Union -- in particular, its admonition to “to learn to think in a new way” and its “appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity and forget the rest.” Reformist Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and his foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze have cited the Manifesto as inspiration for their “new thinking” and the prevalence of “all-human values” over class differences in Soviet foreign policy of the late 1980s. In his contribution to this collection, Lawrence Wittner traces the entire history of the nuclear disarmament movement, from the Russell-Einstein Manifesto to the Gorbachev-Shevardnadze initiatives. Drawing on his comprehensive three-volume study of international disarmament movements of the postwar period, Wittner sets the stage for the

pieces that follow.¹⁶ E.P. Thompson's "Notes on Exterminism" is both an historical document in itself and a contribution to Peace Studies. The renowned British historian was also a prominent peace activist, a member of CND since the 1950s and a founder of the transnational movement for European Nuclear Disarmament (END) in the 1980s. His article in the *New Left Review* offered an analysis of the nuclear arms race, with echoes of some of the literature presented in Volume II of this work and elsewhere, and a call to action.¹⁷ Arguing that the arms race was no longer about genuine political and security differences but "about itself," he called for a continent-wide citizens' movement to link Western peace activists with human-rights dissidents in the Soviet bloc.

A complementary diagnosis and solution was offered during the same period by Randall Forsberg. In this article, in a way consistent with Christopher Paine's analysis from Volume II, she connects the nuclear arms race to the buildup of conventional armies across the East-West divide in Europe and the vast forces, especially of the United States, intended for military intervention abroad. A freeze in the development and deployment of new nuclear weapons, and subsequent reductions, Forsberg argues, could be made possible by restraints on conventional forces, starting with a limitation of their use to purposes of territorial defense. Here her work links up with that of European peace researchers such as Anders Boserup and Lutz Unterseher, leading proponents of non-offensive defense, and reflects as well the findings of Jervis and Van Evera on the destabilizing consequences of offensive military postures.¹⁸

In the late 1980s, Forsberg participated in a transnational coalition of US, Soviet, and Eastern and Western European scholars and activists. Their work contributed to some major initiatives in Soviet security policy (including a unilateral reduction and restructuring of conventional forces)

¹⁶ Lawrence S. Wittner, *The Struggle against the Bomb*, 3 vols. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993-2003).

¹⁷ Thompson's analysis bore some similarity, for example, to the influential work of Dieter Senghaas and his notions of "configurative causality," autism, and *Eigendynamik*, the self-centered, self-sustaining, impetus to arms production. See, in particular, his *Ruestung und Militarismus* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1972). For a review of this literature, see Matthew Evangelista, *Innovation and the Arms Race* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), chap. 1.

¹⁸ Anders Boserup and Robert Neild, eds., *The Foundations of Defensive Defence* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).

that helped bring the Cold War in Europe to an end. Matthew Evangelista's article recounts the efforts of this transnational coalition of Soviet, European, and US scientist-activists to promote related initiatives of nuclear disarmament; their success, he argues, owes in part to the highly centralized nature of the Soviet political system that allowed reformist Soviet leaders to implement bold initiatives, even against resistance from the traditional national security bureaucracies. Post-Soviet Russia, he argues, paradoxically, did not offer such opportunities to disarmament activists. The influence of the security establishment reemerged, unconstrained by Communist Party discipline.

Transnational disarmament efforts did not cease with the end of the Cold War or the demise of the Soviet Union. Peace activists retained and enhanced their transnational organizational networks and began pursuing other initiatives, such as a worldwide ban on landmines. In this volume, Richard Price discusses the remarkable campaign that led to the signing of the Ottawa Treaty in 1997 and the implications for theories of "transnational civil society."

Alternative Visions. In addition to the historical and theoretical work associated with Peace Studies, the field has always had a normative and forward-looking dimension. Some scholars have sought to provide alternative visions of a more just and peaceful future, and many have combined analysis of the current situation with projections and prescriptions.¹⁹ This final section of the volume includes both original work by Peace Studies scholars and literature reviews and analyses of other work. We begin with an essay by Mary Kaldor, a member of the original SIPRI team of researchers who became a founding member of the European Nuclear Disarmament movement and has been active on a range of issues related to peace and conflict in the post-Cold War world. She presents a distillation of much of her recent work on "new wars" – a category that includes organized crime and massive violations of human rights, and is linked to globalization and the concurrent privatization of even basic state functions such as provision of security.²⁰ In an analysis that bears some similarities to Fabio Armao's essay in Volume III, she proposes a

¹⁹ Richard Falk, *Explorations at the Edge of Time: The Prospects for World Order* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1991); Robert C. Johansen, *Toward an Alternative Security System* (New York: World Policy Institute, 1983).

²⁰ For a fuller treatment, see Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999).

“cosmopolitan” solution to the security challenges posed by globalization’s new wars and contrasts it the prevailing alternative approaches.

Although much of Peace Studies deals with the study of wars – both old and new – there is a considerable body of scholarship that analyzes and advocates nonviolent alternatives. The pioneer in this field of nonviolent action is Gene Sharp, the author of many volumes of history and theory about organized, nonviolent opposition to military occupation and internal repression – but not, as far as one can tell, of any single article suitable for inclusion in a collection such as this.²¹ Fortunately, Kurt Schock has prepared an excellent overview, reprinted here, of the work of Sharp and other scholars of nonviolent action, formulated as a series of corrections of misconceptions about the concept and intended for a broad audience of social scientists.

At the heart of the cosmopolitan project that Mary Kaldor advocates, and of many of the movements for nonviolent action described by Kurt Schock, is a conception of a transnational civil society that promotes social change in a wide range of areas, including war, human rights, gender equality, labor rights, and the environment. Richard Price’s review essay summarizes and evaluates the state-of-the-art in the scholarship on transnational politics and suggests directions for further work.

The collection closes with an example of a transnational peace movement in the making: Global Action to Prevent War is the product of a coalition of veteran peace movement activists, retired diplomats, and scholars. Their proposal is a fitting conclusion to this collection in that it draws on and reflects much of the accumulated wisdom of the field of Peace Studies. On some issues still in dispute, readers will note that the proposal often seeks to reconcile the opposing positions. The plan for a staged reduction in weapons for example, addresses David Singer’s armament-tension dilemma by opting for dealing with the arms; yet, the parallel provisions for involving international and regional institutions are intended to serve as a means to reduce tension. As Harald Mueller would hope, the proposal does not make progress towards peace contingent on the impossible task of fully abolishing “structural violence,” as a literal reading of Johan Galtung might imply. Yet, the authors argue, “by increasing respect for human dignity and saving billions of dollars for productive uses, Global Action will contribute to the reduction of structural violence within and among nations.” The proposal

²¹ Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston, MA: Sargent Publishers, 1973), and many subsequent works.

focuses a good deal of attention on the actions of states and international institutions. At the same time, it recognizes the importance of building a “culture of peace” at the local and even family level, as Elise Boulding and others have argued, but expects locally-oriented activists to think globally and endorse the proposal’s prescriptions for the behavior of their countries in the international system.²² The proposal’s short-term goals are consistent with traditional practice of arms control and reliance on international institutions, such as the United Nations, for peacekeeping and “peace enforcement,” but in the longer-term perspective it embraces the creative use of nonviolence embodied in the work of Gene Sharp (and summarized in this collection by Kurt Schock).

The specifics of this particular proposal are still evolving – and must, by necessity, change to reflect changes in the practices of states and the possibilities of social movements. The authors refer to a “coalition-building network-in-formation” and the proposal itself as a “work in progress.” Reprinting it here is not intended as a prediction that the world peace movement will necessarily follow the path set out by Global Action to Prevent War. Rather, the proposal represents one of many initiatives that reflect the collected wisdom of decades of research in Peace Studies and the collaboration between scholars, reform-minded government officials, activists, and ordinary citizens to produce a more just and peaceful world. Peace Studies as a field is also a “work in progress,” one that has adapted over the past half century to face challenges as diverse as the threat of mass nuclear destruction, terrorism, and the communal violence that afflicts many parts of the globe. The body of work represented in this collection provides a base of knowledge to confront the challenges facing the world in the new century as well.

²² *Abolishing War: Dialogue with Peace Scholars Elise Boulding and Randall Forsberg* (Boston, MA: Boston Research Center, 1998).

Peace Studies: Critical Concepts in Political Science

VOLUME I

Editor's Introduction

War and Peace: The Scope of the Problem

Johan Galtung, 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research*, 6, 3, 1969, pp. 167-191.

Harald Mueller, 'Theories of Peace', *Lettres de Byblos*, no. 1 (Byblos, Lebanon: Centre International des Sciences de l'Homme, 2003), 32 pp.

Milton Leitenberg, 'Deaths in Wars and Conflicts Between 1945 and 2000', Cornell University, Peace Studies Program Occasional Paper #29, July 2003, 56 pp.

Henry Shue, 'War', in Hugh LaFollette, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Practical Ethics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 734-61.

Randall Caroline Forsberg, 'Socially-Sanctioned and Non-Sanctioned Violence: On the Role of Moral Beliefs in Causing and Preventing War and Other Forms of Large-Group Violence', in Ruth Stanley, ed., *Konflikt und Gewalt in der globalisierten Welt*, Festschrift für Ulrich Albrecht, (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2001), pp. 201-230.

Theories of Cooperation and Conflict

Kenneth Boulding, 'National Images and International Systems', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 3, 2, 1959, pp. 120-131.

Robert Jervis, 'Cooperation under the Security Dilemma', *World Politics*, 30, 2, 1978, pp.167-214.

Robert Axelrod, 'The Emergence of Cooperation Among Egoists', *The American Political Science Review*, 75, 2, 1981, pp. 306-318.

Deborah Welch Larson, 'Crisis Prevention and the Austrian State Treaty', *International Organization*, 41, 1, 1987, pp. 27-60.

Matthew Evangelista, 'Cooperation Theory and Disarmament Negotiations in the 1950s', *World Politics*, 42, 4, 1990, pp. 502-528.

Richard Ned Lebow, 'Thomas Schelling and Strategic Bargaining', *International Journal*, 51, 3, 1996, pp. 555-576.

Janice Gross Stein, 'Image, Identity, and Conflict Resolution', in Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall, eds., *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing Conflict*, (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001), pp. 189-208.

Neta Crawford, 'A Security Regime among Democracies: Cooperation among Iroquois Nations', *International Organization*, 48, 3, 1994, pp. 345-385.

VOLUME II

Causes of War

Stephen Van Evera, 'The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War', *International Security*, 9, 1, 1984, pp. 58-107.

Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder, 'Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity', *International Organization*, 44, 2, 1990, pp. 137-168.

Ted Hopf, 'Polarity, the Offense-Defense Balance, and War', *The American Political Science Review*, 85, 2, 1991, pp. 475-493.

James Fearon, 'Rationalist Explanations for War', *International Organization*, 49, 3, 1995, pp. 379-414.

Jonathan Kirshner, 'Rationalist Explanations for War?', *Security Studies*, 10, 1, 2000, pp. 143-150.

Arms Races and Arms Control

J. David Singer, 'Threat-Perception and the Armament-Tension Dilemma', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 1, 1958, pp. 90-105.

Fred Block, 'Economic Instability and Military Strength: The Paradoxes of the 1950 Rearmament Decision', *Politics and Society*, 10, 1, 1980, pp. 35-58.

James Kurth, 'A Widening Gyre: The Logic of American Weapons Procurement', *Public Policy*, 19, 3, 1971, pp. 373-404.

Matthew Evangelista, 'Issue-Area and Foreign Policy Revisited', *International Organization* 43, 1, 1989, pp. 147-172

Charles Glaser, 'The Political Consequences of Military Strategy', *World Politics*, 44, 4, 1992, pp. 497-538.

Emanuel Adler, 'The Emergence of Cooperation: National Epistemic Communities and the International Evolution of the Idea of Nuclear Arms Control', *International Organization*, 46, 1, 1992 pp. 101-145.

Christopher Paine, 'On the Beach: The Rapid Deployment Force and the Nuclear Arms Race', *Middle East Research and Information Project Reports*, no. 111, 1983, pp. 3-11, 30.

Etel Solingen, 'The Political Economy of Nuclear Restraint', *International Security*, 19, 2, 1994, pp. 126-169.

VOLUME III

Civil and Ethnic Conflict

Ashutosh Varshney, 'Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, and Rationality', *Perspectives on Politics*, 1, 1, 2003, pp. 85-99.

Stathis N. Kalyvas, 'The Ontology of 'Political Violence': Action and Identity in Civil Wars', *Perspectives on Politics*, 1, 3, 2003, pp. 475-494.

V. P. Gagnon, Jr., 'Ethnic Nationalism and International Conflict: The Case of Serbia', *International Security*, 19, 3, 1994/95, pp. 130-166.

Georgi Derluguian, 'Che Guevaras in Turbans', *New Left Review*, I, 237, 1999, pp. 3-27.

William Reno, 'African Weak States and Commercial Alliances', *African Affairs*, 96, 383, 1997, pp. 165-185.

Gender and Conflict.

Carol Cohn, 'Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals', *Signs: Journal of Women and Culture in Society*, 12, 4, 1987, pp. 687-718.

Matthew Evangelista, 'Rough-and-Tumble World: Men Writing about Gender and War', *Perspectives on Politics*, 1, 2, 2003, pp. 327-334.

Cynthia Enloe, 'All the Men Are in the Militias, All the Women Are Victims: The Politics of Masculinity and Femininity in Nationalist Wars', in Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin, eds., *The Women and War Reader*, (New York: New York University Press, 1998), pp. 50-62.

Lorraine Dowler, 'And They Think I'm Just a Nice Old Lady' *Women and War in Belfast, Northern Ireland*, *Gender, Place and Culture*, 5, 2, 1998, pp. 159-176.

Terrorism, Counterterrorism, and Peace-building

Peter J. Katzenstein, 'Same War – Different Views: Germany, Japan, and Counterterrorism', *International Organization*, 57, 4, 2003, pp. 731-760.

Fabio Armao, 'Who is the Enemy? Scenarios of War in Times of Globalization'

Eva Bertram, 'Reinventing Governments: The Promise and Perils of United Nations Peace Building', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39, 3, 1995, pp. 387-418.

Ekaterina Stepanova, 'Anti-terrorism and Peace-building during and after Conflict', Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, June 2003, 54 pp.

Ethical and Legal Aspects

Leo Szilard, 'My Trial as a War Criminal', in Barton Bernstein ed., *The Voice of the Dolphins, and Other Stories*, (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), pp. 103-114.

Mona Fixdal and Dan Smith, 'Humanitarian Intervention and Just War', *Mershon International Studies Review*, 42, 2, 1998, pp. 283-312.

Thomas W. Smith, 'The New Law of War: Legitimizing Hi-Tech and Infrastructure Violence', *International Studies Quarterly*, 46, 3, 2002, pp. 355-374.

Neta Crawford, 'Just War Theory and the U.S. Counterterror War', *Perspectives on Politics*, 1, 1, 2003, pp. 5-25.

Drew Christiansen and Gerard Powers, 'Unintended Consequences', *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 49, 9, 1993, pp. 41-45.

VOLUME IV

Security Communities

John M. Owen, 'How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace', *International Security*, 19, 2, 1994, pp.50-86.

Ido Oren, 'The Subjectivity of the 'Democratic' Peace: Changing U.S. Perceptions of Imperial Germany', *International Security*, 20, 2, 1995, pp. 147-184.

Thomas Risse-Kappen, 'Democratic Peace – Warlike Democracies? A Social Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Argument', *European Journal of International Relations*, 1, 4, 1995, pp. 491-517.

Peter Katzenstein and Christopher Hemmer, 'Why is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism', *International Organization*, 56, 3, 2002, pp. 575-609.

Sebastian Rosato, 'The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory', *The American Political Science Review*, 97, 4, 2003, pp. 585-602.

Peace Activism

The Russell-Einstein Manifesto, 9 July 1955, 1 p.

Lawrence S. Wittner, 'The Worldwide Movement against Nuclear Arms: Building an Effective Transnational Organization', *Peace Research*, 31, 4, 1999, pp. 18-25.

Edward P. Thompson, 'Notes on exterminism, the last stage of civilization', *New Left Review* 121, 5-6, 1980, pp. 3-31.

Randall Forsberg, 'The Freeze and Beyond: Confining the Military to Defense as a Route to Disarmament', *World Policy Journal*, 1, 1, 1984, pp. 285-318.

Matthew Evangelista, 'The Paradox of State Strength: Transnational Relations, Domestic Structures, and Security Policy in Russia and the Soviet Union', *International Organization*, 49, 1, 1995, pp. 1-38.

Richard Price, 'Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Landmines', *International Organization*, 52, 3, 1998, pp. 613-644.

Alternative Visions in Theory and Practice

Mary Kaldor, 'Cosmopolitanism and organised violence', paper prepared for Conference on 'Conceiving Cosmopolitanism', Warwick, UK, 27-29 April 2000, 10 pp..

Kurt Schock, 'Nonviolent Action and its Misconceptions: Insights for Social Scientists', *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 36, 4, 2003, pp. 705-712.

Richard Price, 'Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics', *World Politics*, 55, 4, 2003, pp. 579-606.

Randall Forsberg, et al., 'Global Action to Prevent War', 2003, 21 pp.